

to sit directly behind me here, Paul Wellstone of Minnesota. I miss him every single day. I pulled out the statement he made relative to this use of force resolution. I can recall now when he said some of these words.

I quote from Senator Wellstone:

To act now on our own might be a sign of more power. Acting sensibly and in a measured way in concert with our allies with bipartisan congressional support would be a sign of our strength.

It is still true today. It is true so many months later.

I think the President and this administration still have a chance to take what could be a course of action that departs from a tradition in values which we have stood by and preached for so many decades, and return to those values in our efforts in Iraq.

And I hope we do it. I hope we do not discard the United Nations and all of our allies who are part of it. I hope we understand that when some of our best friends around the world question whether we are approaching this sensibly, it does not demonstrate their weakness but really calls into question whether we have the humility to step back and say: Can we do this more effectively for a more peaceful world for generations to come?

Madam President, I close by saying, I return now, in just a few moments, to my home State of Illinois. As I walk the streets of Springfield, of Chicago, and of other cities, people come up to me and say: Why don't I hear a debate in the U.S. Congress about Iraq?

Well, the fact is, that debate was waged and decided last October. I was one of 23 Members who voted against the use of force resolution because I believe there is a better way: a collective approach with the United Nations, that makes certain that the United States has a coalition of nations behind it in suppressing the evil of Saddam Hussein and his dangers to the region, rather than a coalition of nations united against us. That, sadly, is what we face today.

The vote in the United Nations tomorrow is historic. I hope we have the support of that institution. I hope, if we do not, this administration will pause before unleashing the furies of war and consider whether there is a better, more measured and sensible approach to show not only our might but our strength and clarity of purpose.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, my colleague from Illinois has been talking about foreign policy and, more specifically, about Iraq and the use of force. He touched on the issue of North Korea and terrorism.

We do need to have more debate, aggressive and thoughtful debate, about all of these issues. There is no question that North Korea, in my judgment, and

in the judgment of many in this country, is an urgent, serious threat to our country. They kicked out the inspectors. And they do have nuclear weapons, at least according to our intelligence officials. They believe North Korea does have nuclear weapons.

The threat of terrorism continues in this country. Homeland security is a top priority. And all of these issues are very important. But I want to speak about an issue here at home; that is, domestic policy, especially this country's economy.

We wake up every morning—for months in this country—hearing the lead story on the news being war with Iraq. It is the lead story every morning, bar none. It is an important story, no question about that. But there are a lot of folks who wake up in this country these days who are out of jobs. Some 8 million people—perhaps more than that, we are told—do not have work.

Madam President, 308,000 additional people lost their jobs last month alone—308,000 people. Do you know who loses their jobs first? Oh, it is not Members of Congress and it is not people who drive big cars. It is the people who know the definition of “second-hand,” “second shift,” “second jobs.” It is the people who struggle at the bottom of the economic ladder. They are the last to be hired and the first to go.

This economy of ours is in trouble. It is time to stop tiptoeing around and pretending about it. We have two Budget Committees meeting now in this Congress. We have a budget submitted by this President that is completely, in my judgment, irresponsible. That is not a partisan criticism, it is just a criticism of a budget that completely ignores what is happening in this country. It is a budget that pretends everything is just fine and all we need to do is keep doing what we have been doing and this country will see its economy come out of the doldrums. That is patently untrue, in my judgment. It is time for us to say that.

Let me talk a bit about this plan and about where we are. There is not a Democrat or Republican way to fix what is wrong with this ship of state with respect to its economy. But there are right ways and wrong ways to do it. And I know that the moment we dare criticize the administration, we have all of these strident voices from the extreme of the political system who say: Well, how dare you criticize the administration or the President.

Look, I think both parties have done plenty wrong in this country's past. But we face an intersection now that is unlike any intersection America has come to in a long time. This intersection is one where we confront both serious, urgent foreign policy problems—Iraq, North Korea, terrorism, and more—and, at the same time, confront very serious problems here at home—an economy that is languishing, without growth, an economy that, last

month, saw 308,000 people lose their jobs.

Now just think of one of those. I am not asking you to think about 1,000, 10,000, 100,000 or 300,000—just one, who comes home and says to his or her family: Something happened at work today. I lost my job. It wasn't my fault. I have done the best I could. I am a good worker, but I have lost my job because the economy is not working well. It's soft.

So what happens here in Washington, DC? Well, we act as if none of this is going on. This is a cheering section, to say: Well, things are going to be better. This is not a problem. What are you complaining about?

Let me talk, just a little, about where we are with this economy of ours.

We have a \$10 trillion economy in this country. This is the biggest, the best economy in the world. None of us would want to live elsewhere. We are lucky to be Americans, lucky to be Americans alive now. But our responsibility, as Americans, is to nurture, protect, and foster the development of this great country of ours, and that means protecting this economic engine that produces the jobs and the opportunities for the American people.

Now, in May of 2001, we had an economy that economists told us would produce budget surpluses at the Federal level as far as the eye could see. They said: I tell you, we're walking in tall clover here. There are going to be budget surpluses for 10 years, so you all ought to get about the business of providing big, big tax cuts.

President Bush came to town and said: My heavy lifting is to ask the American people to accept big tax cuts. That is the easiest lift in American politics, I guarantee you. I would like to see one politician who works up a sweat asking people to accept tax cuts.

So the President said: \$1.7 trillion in tax cuts; that's my plan. I stood at this desk then, and I said: I think we ought be a little conservative. What if something happens? What if we are giving away money we don't get? What if we don't have these surpluses? What if something that we can't predict at this point occurs and these surpluses don't exist? What you are going to do is run into big deficits and have our children shoulder the consequences of this mistake.

Well, I lost that debate. And so a \$1.7 trillion tax cut proposed by the President was pushed through this Congress. And guess what. In a matter of months—just a matter of months—we discovered our economy was in a recession. Months after that, September 11, the most devastating terrorist attack against this country in its history; months after that, a series of corporate scandals unlike any we have ever seen in this country; during all of that time, the bursting of the technology bubble and the collapsing and pancaking of the stock market; and during all of that time, the prosecution of a war against terrorism.

You think about that, all of those consequences—a recession, the bursting of the technology bubble, the pancaking of the stock market, corporate scandals, a war against terrorism. All of that combined to create a dramatic difference in this economy. We have far less revenue coming in. And the result is, big deficits.

Here is what we found:

In May of 2001, Mr. Daniels, the head of OMB, said: We are going to have a \$5.6 trillion surplus. We had better get about the business of having big tax cuts, he and the President said.

Well, in 2 years, we went from a \$5.6 trillion estimated surplus to a \$2.1 trillion deficit. That is nearly an \$8 trillion change in the economic fortunes of this country. And yet we have people acting as if it is not happening. None of this is happening, according to them.

What is the antidote to this? What do we do? Well, let's ratchet up some more tax cuts. Short of money? Well, then, reduce your revenue stream. So the President proposes more large tax cuts.

I suppose if you don't care about fiscal responsibility, about budget deficits, then you can do that. But the fact is, we have seen this calculation before. I come from a high school of nine. We didn't have higher math, but there is only one way to add one and one that equals two. That is the math book I studied.

The fact is, this administration's budget does not add up. They say increase defense spending, increase homeland security spending, have less revenue, and have a few budget cuts in domestic discretionary programs, and it will all add up. It doesn't add up. They want to pretend that it adds up. The American people know it doesn't add up.

On the domestic discretionary piece, they say let's increase these two big areas of spending: Defense, homeland security. Let's cut taxes. And incidentally, let's cut taxes on average for someone with \$1 million a year in income, let's cut their taxes on average nearly \$90,000 a year. We can afford that, they say. But, they say, what we will do is take it out of domestic discretionary spending, nondefense. What does that mean? That means what we will do is cut back on title I spending. That is what they talked about in one of the budget resolutions today.

I toured a school about 2 weeks ago. At the library there was a third grader, a young boy, great-looking young kid, looking at a book and pictures. I met him and said hi to him. I came up behind him and tapped him on the shoulder. The principal of the school, after we got out of earshot of the young boy, said: Do you know something about that boy? You can't tell it right now, but that young boy almost died. He was subject to the most severe abuse I have ever seen in a family. He was beaten badly, taken away from his mother because of the beatings. You know he is doing very well now. This little kid has kind of gotten through all of this. He is

doing well. This kid is part of the program for the school, the title I funds for disadvantaged kids. That is the kind of investment we make in these kids. And this little boy needed some of that investment. That is what we do with title I, with Head Start. We give these tiny kids who don't have it so good an opportunity to get a head start in education.

With Pell grants, kids who couldn't go to college get an opportunity to go to college. I had a young Native American stand up in a meeting once and say: Mr. Senator, I am an American Indian. I am the first in my family ever to go to college. I am able to be here because I have Pell grants, because we don't have any money. I will graduate from this college, and I will go back to teach school on the Indian reservation which I came from.

He did. That is the value of investing in some of these programs such as education programs for some of these kids. We can just talk about it as if it is some amorphous program that does not mean anything with no names attached, but that is not the case. All of these investments in the lives of young children make a difference. So when we talk about fiscal policy and plans and budgets, it is just too easy for some people who don't understand that there is a constituency out there. They don't have lobbyists in the hallway. There are no 5-year-olds or 6-year-olds or 3-year-olds waiting as we leave the Chamber to say: Please, Mr. Senator, will you help us. They don't have the voices here.

The fact is, just taking one example of what we do that makes a difference in people's lives, in education of children, especially children who haven't had it so good, we have people who just blithely walk around here these days and say: This is not a difficult circumstance to get out of. Give the wealthy some very big tax cuts, spend \$675 billion that we don't have, charge it to the kids, cut back on education programs, and cut back on many of the other programs that help people who don't have it so good and call it a day. Have a good night's sleep.

Those who can sleep with those priorities, in my judgment, have a misplaced priority of public service. The priority in this country ought to be, first of all, to have a fiscal plan that adds up so this country's economy has a chance to grow and provide opportunities and jobs for people.

There is no social program we work on that is as important for working people as a good job that pays well. So making this economy work, giving it the opportunity to work, having it add up so people have confidence in the future is critically important. And then at the same time preserving the opportunity for some very important things, whether it is helping family farmers during a disaster, helping young kids get a chance to start in school through the Head Start program—all of those are so important.

We are doing a shadow dance in this Chamber. Everybody here knows this nonsense does not add up, and no one is willing to say it because the minute you say it, people start screaming that you are somehow disloyal to this administration.

I want this administration to succeed. I want this President to succeed. I want him to succeed so this country does well. I want our economy to grow. I want our foreign policy challenges with Iraq and North Korea and others to work out in the right way. I don't come here wanting us to fail. But if we don't stand up and point out the obvious, that we are headed down a path toward deeper and deeper Federal budget deficits with which we will saddle our children, if we don't change course, this country is not going to grow and will not provide opportunities.

I suppose there will be many who will continue this shadow dance that goes on to pretend everything is just fine, but we know better than that. If we were headed towards these deficits with the previous administration, I guarantee you there would be 20 people in this Chamber every night putting blue smoke out the Chamber; they would be so upset about it. But somehow in the shadow of 9/11, we have moved to a circumstance where the most irresponsible fiscal policy I have ever seen proposed is judged to be a yawn by this Chamber.

We have the two Budget Committees meeting, and they are saying: We can fit all this in. We can fit in big tax cuts. In fact, now they say—those so-called conservatives—deficits don't even matter. It is not a big thing to be worried about.

I don't understand what has happened with respect to the relative positions of politicians these days. Conservatives say deficits don't matter? That is a different kind of conservative than I am familiar with. Deficits, of course, matter. Someone has to repay them.

I don't mean to belabor this point, but on top of this fiscal policy that has us now headed towards the largest deficits in the history of our country, take Social Security out of the calculation, and you should. The Social Security surpluses should not be used to reduce the budget deficit. They are trust funds. The President proposes taking all the trust fund and using it, but they ought not. So if you take that out, you have a budget deficit this year of nearly \$450 billion. But add to that a trade deficit of over \$460 billion this year alone—the highest in human history. This economy is off course. We need to fix it.

We need to stand up for the economic interests of America in trade and begin reducing that trade deficit, because we have to pay that with a lower standard of living in our future. That is not an option. That trade deficit is owed to other countries. You can make an argument as an economist that the budget deficit we owe to ourselves. Nonetheless, we will still have to bear that

burden. But our children will likely bear the burden of a 10-year deficit that is put on their shoulders by a fiscal policy that is irresponsible.

We will have a budget debate next week. I will offer amendments. My colleagues will offer amendments. I don't have any interest in deciding that Republicans have the wrong answer and Democrats have the right answer. There are good answers that come from all parts of the Chamber. But the construct of this fiscal policy is just fundamentally wrong and everybody in this Chamber who knows how to add and subtract ought to know that. It is time for us to start speaking about it.

I am perfectly interested in providing tax cuts to the American people when we have budget surpluses. But the tax cuts should be to working families and should be distributed fairly. But at a time when we have the highest deficits, to say let's ignore them and let's have a political construct that increases spending in the largest areas of spending in the Federal budget and decreases taxes with very large tax cuts and then pulls the rest out of it out of some very important things that invest in people in this country, including veterans and Indian health and education, and a whole series of things, that is wrong.

We need to stand up and talk about it. I will speak about it at greater length next week. I wish I could come to the floor and say this is a wonderful fiscal policy. I just cannot. I feel obligated to say this is wrong; we are headed in the wrong direction. We need to fix it as a country. Our children's future depends on it.

I will make one final point. On September 11, when this country was attacked, we were one country. I was proud of President Bush, and one of the best speeches I ever heard he gave to a joint session of Congress. This country responded as one. But this country does not do a service to its future by believing now—a year and a half following that period of time—that voices still, because they don't want to engage in debate over issues that are important to our future, are somehow disadvantageous to our country. We need a robust debate about the right fiscal policy. We disserve our constituencies if we don't bring this debate to the floor in an aggressive way. What works? What will restore economic health to the country? What do we do to improve economic growth, to provide jobs, to get people back to work, and get the economy moving again? Those are the questions we have to ask as we construct a budget and put this fiscal policy together.

I regret I come to say this fiscal policy makes no sense at all and must be changed. I wish that were not the case, but it is. The result of that is I will be here with amendments, as will others, hoping we can improve this fiscal policy for our country's future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

THE WORDS OF ALISTAIR COOKE

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I am glad to see an Alaskan in the chair as I make this statement. This morning, as it usually happens, when I turned on my computer, I found a series of e-mails from friends at home. I do not always have time to read them then, but I saw one from a very close friend, who has been a friend now for over 50 years—Frank Reed, a former neighbor, a person who has helped me in many ways in my life. He asked me to read this article he attached to his e-mail. I get a little disturbed when I see that the testament is a little longer than the e-mail. But I found that he had sent me a verbatim transcript of an article by Alistair Cooke entitled "Peace For Our Time," that was on the BBC News on Monday, February 3 of this year. I want to read that tonight because I think it reflects what I have been trying to say on the floor of the Senate these past several weeks.

The following was written and spoken by Alistair Cooke. He said this:

... I promised to lay off topic A—Iraq—until the Security Council makes a judgment on the inspectors' report and I shall keep that promise.

But I must tell you that throughout the past fortnight I've listened to everybody involved in or looking on to a monotonous din of words, like a tide crashing and receding on a beach—making a great noise and saying the same thing over and over. And this ordeal triggered a nightmare—a day-mare, if you like.

Through the ceaseless tide I heard a voice, a very English voice of an old man—Prime Minister Chamberlain saying: "I believe it is peace for our time"—a sentence that prompted a huge cheer, first from a listening street crowd and then from the House of Commons and next day from every newspaper in the land.

There was a move to urge that Mr. Chamberlain should receive the Nobel Peace Prize. In Parliament there was one unfamiliar old grumbler to growl out: "I believe we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat." He was, in view of the general sentiment, very properly booed down.

This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 with the British prime minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. The rest of it, within months, Hitler walked in and conquered. "Oh dear," said Mr. Chamberlain, thunderstruck. "He has betrayed my trust."

During the last fortnight a simple but startling thought occurred to me—every single official, diplomat, president, prime minister involved in the Iraq debate was in 1938 a toddler, most of them unborn. So the dreadful scene I've just drawn will not have been remembered by most listeners.

Hitler had started betraying our trust not 12 years but only two years before, when he broke the First World War peace treaty by occupying the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland. Only half his troops carried one reload of ammunition because Hitler knew that French morale was too low to confront any war just then and 10 million of 11 million British voters had signed a so-called peace ballot.

It stated no conditions, elaborated no terms, it simply counted the numbers of Britons who were "for peace."

The slogan of this movement was "Against war and fascism"—chanted at the time by every Labour man and Liberal and many

moderate Conservatives—a slogan that now sounds as imbecilic as "against hospitals and disease." In blunter words a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him.

At that time the word pre-emptive had not been invented, though today it's a catchword. After all the Rhineland was what it said it was—part of Germany. So to march in and throw Hitler out would have been pre-emptive—wouldn't it?

Nobody did anything and Hitler looked forward with confidence to gobbling up the rest of Western Europe country by country—"course by course", as growler Churchill put it.

I bring up Munich and the mid-30s because I was fully grown, on the verge of 30, and knew we were indeed living in the age of anxiety. And so many of the arguments mounted against each other today, in the last fortnight, are exactly what we heard in the House of Commons debates and read in the French press.

The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion, "negotiation, negotiation". They negotiated so successfully as to have their whole country defeated and occupied. But as one famous French leftist said:

"We did anyway manage to make them declare Paris an open city—no bombs on us!"

In Britain the general response to every Hitler advance was disarmament and collective security. Collective security meant to leave every crisis to the League of Nations. It would put down aggressors, even though, like the United Nations, it had no army, navy or air force.

The League of Nations had its chance to prove itself when Mussolini invaded and conquered Ethiopia (Abyssinia). The League didn't have any shot to fire. But still the cry was chanted in the House of Commons—the League and collective security is the only true guarantee of peace.

But after the Rhineland the maverick Churchill decided there was no collectivity in collective security and started a highly unpopular campaign for rearmament by Britain, warning against the general belief that Hitler had already built an enormous mechanized army and superior air force.

But he's not used them, he's not used them—people protested.

Still for two years before the outbreak of the Second War you could read the debates in the House of Commons and now shiver at the famous Labour men—Major Attlee was one of them—who voted against rearmament and still went on pointing to the League of Nations as the savior.

Now, this memory of mine may be totally irrelevant to the present crisis. It haunts me. I have to say I have written elsewhere with much conviction that most historical analogies are false because, however strikingly similar a new situation may be to an old one, there's usually one element that is different and it turns out to be the crucial one. It may well be so here.

All I know is that all the voices of the 30s are echoing through 2003 . . .

Madam President, I was but 14, not 30. I remember the tension we all felt at that time, as country after country became destroyed by Hitler. Previously on the floor of the Senate, I mentioned Hitler and compared Saddam Hussein to Hitler. I was criticized even by the papers at home in Alaska.

I was delighted to read Alistair Cooke's article that Frank Reed sent to me this morning, and I commend it to the rest of the Senate.

This haunts me. It haunts those of us who lived through the thirties to know